UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/057,523	01/22/2002	George M. White	2222.0820005	5053	
	7590 04/22/201 SLER, GOLDSTEIN &	EXAMINER			
1100 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.			LERNER, MARTIN		
WASHINGTON, DC 20005			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2626		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			04/22/2010	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/057,523	WHITE ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
MARTIN LERNER	2626		

	MARTIN LERNER	2626	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 16 April 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPI	ICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of A eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavit al (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ac no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth it ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extrunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the siset forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1: ension and the corresponding amount on the ortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exten Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further con (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett	sideration and/or search (see NOT v);	E below);	
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1	l6 and 41.33(a)).		
 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowed. 	·	,	,
non-allowable claim(s). 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 59, 61 to 66, 68 to 73, 75 to 79, 81, and Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	ided below or appended.	l be entered and an ex	xplanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	ıl and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a
10. \square The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/Martin Lerner/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 2626	

Continuation of 3. NOTE:

Applicants' amendment considerably broadens the claims in some aspects and narrows the claims for the new limitations directed to a high bandwidth communication channel and a low bandwidth communication channel so as to present substantially new claims requiring further search and consideration. Specifically, it is appreciated that Applicants may believe that the current claims were amended so as to follow allowable subject matter identified during a telephone interview for the co-pending (now allowed) application. However, the claims in the co-pending application were allowed due to a combination of all the elements there claimed, and the current claims are considerably broadened by the amendments deleting the limitations directed to updating or modifying the keyword detection and updating the previously stored acoustic models. A preliminary search of the new limitations of a high bandwidth communication channel and a low bandwidth communication channel discovered, e.g., Odinak (U.S. Patent No. 5,929,748), which discloses transmitting simple control information by low data bandwidth channels and transmitting audio and video over high bandwidth channels for a home automation system. (Column 2, Lines 15 to 25) Applicants have amended the independent claims in a manner so that they now only require a distributed speech recognition system having a transceiver for detecting keyword commands that are recognized with an acoustic model. Without the limitations directed to modifying or updating keywords or acoustic models, it is maintained that prior art could be found that discloses these features of a distributed speech recognition system. Thus, it is likely that it would be a simple combination of two references to reject the independent claims as amended. Therefore, Applicants' amendments raise new issues requiring further search and consideration due to the broadening nature of these amendments.